Single Bench

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION NO. 499 /2005

PETITIONER

Rajeshwar Rao Kridat,
S/o. Shri Shivshankar Rao Kridat,
Aged about 40 years,
Occupation - service,
Presently working as Assistant Teacher,
Govt. Purv Madhyamik School, Jhalmala,
Block Development Balod,
District Durg (C.G.).
R/o. Near Devarchana,
Rajnandgaon Marg, Balod,
District Durg (C.G.)

P.R. No. 499/05 Presented by Shri Rajneesh Dubey dated 28.2.05

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh,
Through the Secretary,
School Education Department, Mantralaya,
D.K.S. Bhawan,
Raipur (C.G.)

2. Director,
Lok Shikshan,
Raipur (C.G.)

3. Dy. Director,
Lok Shikshan,
Durg Division,
Durg(C.G.)

COPY 8.2.05 H.C.G. Bilaspur

4. District Education Officer, Durg (C.G.)

5. Head Master,
Govt. Purv Madhyamik School, Jhalmala,
Block Development Balod,
District Durg (C.G.)

6. Smt. Sunita Deshmukh,
Teacher,
Pu-Ma-Shala Godpendry,
Patan, Dist. Durg (C.G.)

7. Rohit Kumar Chandrakar,
Teacher,
Pu-Ma-Shala Vijaytala,
Dist. Rajnandgaon (C.G)

8. Ram Kumar Verma,
Teacher,
Pu-Ma-Shala Sirsakala
Patan, Dist. Durg (C.G)

4

(2)

9. Ajay Chandrakar,
Teacher,
Pu-Ma-Shala Saloni,
Dist. Rajnandgaon (C.G)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI, MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION AND FOR OTHER SUITABLE WRIT OR WRITS, ORDER OR ORDERS, DIRECTION OR DIRECTIONS

55

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION NO.499 OF 2005

Petitioner : Rajeshwar Rao Kridat

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

Present : Mrs. Fouzia Mirza, counsel for the petitioner.
Mr. Ajay Dwivedi, Panel Lawyer for respondents No.1 to 5.
None appears for other respondents.

ORDER
(Passed on 9th of October, 2006)

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the question of law involved in this petition is governed by the Circular dated 20-1-1987. The High Court of Madhya Pradesh in ***Indraveer Singh Tomar vs. State of M.P. and others***[1] has considered the issue and disposed of the said matter in following terms :-

> Para 2 "..... In view of this submission advanced by Counsel for parties, this petition is disposed of by giving following directions. The respondent No.1 shall consider petitioner's representations referred to above and dispose of the same at an early date, preferably within a period of 3 months from the date of communication of this order in accordance with law, keeping in mind the circulars

issued by State Govt. as also the directions given by the Tribunal in similar matters."

2. Learned counsel appearing for the parties would jointly submit and admit that this case, being similar in nature, is squarely covered by the decision of the Madhya Pradesh High Court in the case of *Indraveer Singh Tomar* (Supra).

3. In view of aforestated reasons, this petition is disposed of in the same terms. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

---

1 2004(2) M.P.H.T. 3 (NOC)